

University of Groningen

## Out of love for the village? How general and selective forms of attachment to the village explain volunteering in Dutch community life

Gieling, Joost; Haartsen, Tialda; Vermeij, Lotte; Strijker, Dirk

*Published in:*  
Journal of Rural Studies

*DOI:*  
[10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.06.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.06.008)

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*  
Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

*Publication date:*  
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Gieling, J., Haartsen, T., Vermeij, L., & Strijker, D. (2019). Out of love for the village? How general and selective forms of attachment to the village explain volunteering in Dutch community life. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 71, 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2018.06.008>

### **Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

### **Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

# Out of love for the village? How general and selective forms of attachment to the village explain volunteering in Dutch community life

## Abstract

*In the past century, the increasing scale of daily life has weakened and changed the ways residents feel attached to their village. A general and all-encompassing village attachment has evolved into less involving, more selective and partial forms of attachment. Concerns have been raised as to whether these changing forms affect volunteering in village life. In this paper we distinguish between general and selective forms of attachment to the village – social, cultural and environmental attachment – and explore their effects on local volunteering. In line with the theory of ‘selective belonging’, we hypothesise that a general attachment to the village predicts high levels of volunteering in village life, whereas selective forms of attachment only predict volunteering in activities related to the specific form of attachment. Based on survey data on over 5000 rural residents, the results show that general attachment only predicts volunteering to a limited extent and that social attachment does so best. Thus, a loosening general attachment to the village may not weaken community activity as is often feared. Instead, it is social attachment that motivates and facilitates volunteering, including among immigrants. Efforts to strengthen local communities should therefore focus on enhancing social relations between villagers.*

**Key words:** Place attachment; elective belonging; volunteering; logistic regression; the Netherlands

## 1. Introduction

The introduction of what is referred to as the ‘participation society’ (akin to the United Kingdom’s ‘Big Society’) makes research on rural residents’ intentions to do voluntary work timely (Gielsing & Haartsen 2017; Verhoeven & Tonkens 2013). This new policy discourse involves a reallocation of responsibilities from the central state to local communities, translating into a culture of volunteering, self-reliance and community initiatives. To achieve this, residents are delegated more responsibility for safeguarding village liveability through voluntary activity (Bagley & Hillyard 2014; Mohan, 2012; Woolvin & Hardill, 2013; Haartsen & Venhorst, 2010). There is a considerable amount of support among academics for these governmental beliefs, as studies indicate that active participation not only has positive effects on a community level, but also for individuals. Residents of active local communities report high levels of health (Mohnen et al. 2011), social capital (Agnitsch et al. 2006) and security (Sampson et al. 1997).

However, recent rural developments suggest less rather than more engagement within local communities and the extent to which individuals are willing to participate in various aspects of village life might vary considerably (Bagley & Hillyard 2014; Jones & Heley 2016). One reason for the declining motivation to become active in local village life is because residents’ commitment to their immediate living environment is waning (Bauman 2000; Hunter & Suttles 1972; Groot 1989). Ongoing processes of economies of scale and increased mobility have altered the dynamics of community life; general and all-encompassing attachments to the local area have been replaced by more selective and individualised forms of place attachment (Savage et al. 2005; Watt 2009; Barcus & Brunn 2010). Illustrating the limited importance of local community in the lives of present-day residents, two-thirds of the Dutch rural population have all or most of their close friends living elsewhere (Vermeij 2015).

This finding raises questions about the extent to which changing patterns of place attachment may weaken residents' motivations to become active in village life. Although a stable majority of Dutch rural residents volunteer in village life (Posthumus et al. 2013; Steenbekkers & Vermeij 2013), involvement in community life is not necessarily self-evident (cf. Woolvin & Hardill 2013; Skerrat & Steiner 2013).

Thus, whereas residents are increasingly selective in the way they relate to their local surroundings, policymakers increasingly assume that rural citizens are committed to their living environment and would willingly participate in various aspects of village life on a voluntary basis. In other words, although their 'love for the village' is weakening and becoming more selective, villagers are expected to make more effort. This paradox calls for a better understanding of the relationship between the changing forms of place attachment and villagers' involvement in village life. This paper poses the following question: Which general and selective forms of attachment to the village predict voluntary citizen activity in various local clubs and organisations?

This paper begins with a brief contextualisation of the research. To better understand how present-day rural residents are attached to their living environments, we then explain the theory of 'elective' and 'selective' belonging. Next, we discuss how general and selective forms of place attachment may affect the willingness to volunteer in village life. We used unique data from the Socially Vital Countryside Database '14 survey (SVP'14), which provides extensive information on village attachment and volunteering. Logistic regression analyses were performed to assess relationships between different forms of attachment and volunteering. We finish this paper with some concluding remarks.

## **2. Volunteering in a changing rural context**

Through societal, leisure and political participation, rural residents have improved opportunities to reform local society in alignment with their own local wishes and to seek innovative ways to deliver better local services at lower costs (Gieling & Haartsen 2017). This means that the availability of local associations and clubs is becoming increasingly important as they provide a platform for processes of community-making and local conviviality (Neal & Waters 2008). Usually, village organisations strongly rely on the availability and efforts of volunteers. This makes volunteering crucial for maintaining the quality of local of public space and local society. However, motivations to volunteer in such local organisations are very diverse and 'vary according to personal, cultural and structural circumstances' (Brodie et al. 2009; p. 27). Some volunteers feel a deep responsibility for the overall success of the local community and invest a substantial amount of their spare time and effort in achieving this, whilst others only make a relatively small contribution in strengthening the local community. Others decide not be active in village society at all.

The unlikeliness that all residents are willing to make an active contribution to village society makes the contemporary policy emphasis on citizen activity remarkable. A number of long-term rural changes are able to explain why residents' motivations to volunteer locally may have declined. Rural communities in the 20<sup>th</sup> century are often characterised to be in transition from a *Gemeinschaft* order towards a *Gesellschaft* order. The latter type of social order comprises heterogeneous groups of residents who live together in loosely knit communities (Tönnies 1880{1957}). In line with this development, studies by Wellmann (1979) and Wellmann & Leighton (1978) argue that communities became 'liberated' from their immediate spatial contexts. Modern modes of residential, daily and

digital mobility have reduced residents' dependence on neighbourhood ties, with connections between people and places becoming less restricted to the living environment (e.g. Simmel, 1971; Hunter & Suttles 1972; Salamon, 2003; Goodwin-Hawkins 2015). As a consequence, many villages became 'residential', in which relationships, especially with jobs, services and social networks, have changed from a local to a regional scale (Thissen & Loopmans 2013). Whereas some village residents may still perceive their lives within a rural setting as an all-encompassing way of life, others seem to consider their village to be merely a place to live in.

The disappearance of historical communal roots as a key determinant of local community makes it necessary to rethink the various aspects of place that make people active. Villages that successfully cope with the policy shift towards self-reliance are often associated with high levels of human capital, which especially pertains to residents' individual qualities, knowledge and skills. However, the resources that residents possess are not necessarily invested in the immediate living environment. A certain degree of local attachment also seems to be a necessary ingredient for residents to become active, yet its role in community participation and planning remains under-examined (Manzo & Perkins 2006). A shared attachment to a place can motivate cooperative efforts to improve local liveability. But not all rural residents strongly identify with the immediate residential environment and they can be very selective in developing belonging to the rural place (Haartsen & Stockdale 2017). It is therefore feared that the number of residents interested in carrying out voluntary work may be small, and the number of voluntary tasks that these residents need to handle can be overwhelming (Salemink et al. 2017; Allen & Mueller 2013). A better understanding of how present-day residents are attached to their villages and its relation with volunteering will therefore contribute to a realistic assessment of what can be expected of the village community in terms of safeguarding village liveability.

### **2.1. The role of general and selective forms of attachment in rural societies**

Altman and Low (1992) broadly define place attachment as the affective, cognitive and behavioural bonds between a person and a place. It has been thought that place attachment would lose relevance due to an increasing mobile lifestyle of many (rural) residents (Lewicka 2010). A recent view on place attachment, however, has claimed that it has not disappeared but instead is transforming and remains meaningful (Milbourne & Kitchen 2014; Ralph & Staeheli 2011). In a similar vein, Savage (2010) has introduced the concept of 'elective belonging', which entails the notion that place attachment is becoming increasingly optional as mobility increases. Middle-class residents with greater mobility have more options than before and have improved opportunities to reside in places matching their life stories and preferred lifestyles (Savage et al. 2005). Savage et al. (2005; p.29) argue that places have become 'sites to perform identities' and are selected to 'tell stories that indicate how their arrival and subsequent settlement is appropriate to their sense of themselves'. Mobile residents have a privileged position because of their increased freedom of choice to dwell in a specific place which is not just functionally important to them but which also matters symbolically (Savage 2010). They can choose how they want to become attached to a place and perform their preferred (rural) lifestyle activities (Andrews 2001; Walker & Li 2007). Rather than a strong attachment with the village as a whole, selective forms of attachment may only pertain to an aspect of the residential environment, such as its social, cultural or environmental qualities.

Residents who have elected to belong to a specific rural environment will probably not identify strongly with their new village immediately, although they may feel an attachment (McHugh & Mings 1996).

Rather, in accordance with personal interests and life course, residents are selective in how they attach to specific aspects of village life (Haartsen & Stockdale 2017). This process of 'selective belonging' denotes a spatially and socially uneven attachment to the living environment (Watt 2009; Benson & Jackson 2012). Processes of elective and selective attachment are mainly associated with in-migrants. They may consider 'places as routes', with a strong emphasis on mobility, exploring and personal development (Gustafson 2001; 2014). This resonates with Savage's (2010) notion that attachment is partly a choice made by mobile residents, representing a person's self-chosen identity and identification. Whereas some in-migrants choose to remain aloof, others quickly establish social relations in the village or experience a strong attachment to the natural environment (Gustafson 2009; Scannell & Gifford 2010). But village-born residents can also be selective, for instance because they cherish the individual freedom resulting from diminished social control, or disappointedly turn their backs on the village that they no longer feel part of due to disruptions in the socio-physical environment (Brown & Schafft 2011; Brown & Perkins 1992). Contemporary patterns of place attachment are therefore characterised by selection based on individual circumstances, interests and desires.

According to Savage (2010) the rise of new and selective types of belonging does not imply the end of a more general and all-encompassing form of belonging. A general attachment refers to a strong emotional bond and identification with the village as a whole, often the result of an absence of life alternatives (Lewicka 2005). In this respect, Gustafson's (2014) representation of 'places as roots' is applicable: it comprises a historical connection to a place, based upon long-time residence, strong community ties and local knowledge. Whereas older studies often perceive rural inhabitants to be 'deeply rooted' in a rural community (Keur & Keur 1955), more recent studies have suggested that a share of rural residents have remained rooted in a place as a defensive reaction to globalising forces (Gustafson 2001). A strong emphasis on the 'home place' as a shared anchorage of peoples and culture provides residents with a sense of security, that motivates a person to remain located in a specific area (Barcus & Brunn 2010).

Particularly village-born and immobile residents are believed to live in 'places as roots', which may manifest in an all-encompassing and general attachment to the living environment. Savage claims, for example, that 'elective belonging pitches choice against history, as the migrant consumer rubs up against dwellers with historical attachments to place' (Savage 2014; p. 30). Although village-born residents can to some extent be selective in how they belong, shared historical and long-lasting ties with the village mean that they are typically associated with high levels of general attachment (Zwiers et al. 2016). This group of residents is believed to have 'inherited' place and they therefore take the decision to dwell in a place for granted (Lewicka 2013). However, a large proportion of rural in-migration is comprised of lateral rural flows, such as young residents moving to a larger neighbouring village to find affordable housing, or return-migrants who had previously lived in the general destination area (Bijker et al. 2015; Stockdale 2015). This suggests that a proportion of rural in-migrants may also develop a general attachment to the village and its surroundings. Thus, origin is not necessarily conclusive in predicting high levels of either general or selective forms of place attachment (Gielsing et al. 2017).

In sum, whereas 'elective belonging' refers to where (new) residents choose to live, 'selective belonging' refers to how residents choose to relate to the place they live. This process of selective belonging allows for self-chosen partial attachments, with for instance the social, cultural or

environmental qualities. In contrast, general attachment, involving identification and a strong emotional bond with the village as a whole, arises from circumstances. It is reserved to less mobile resident groups and is likely to decline in time.

## **2.2. The relation between different forms of attachment and volunteering**

The observation that place attachment and civic activity are interrelated is not new (Anton & Lawrence 2014; Manzo & Perkins 2006; Musick & Wilson 2008), but it remains unclear how general and selective forms of attachment affect volunteering. There is little doubt that a general attachment results in a collective style of volunteering (Hustinx & Lammertyn 2003). In locally embedded groups with shared general attachments to the village, volunteering is often perceived as a social obligation and an integral and unquestioned part of community life (Thissen & Drooglever Fortuijn 1998). Residents strongly rooted within a village culture often share a local identity and tend to cite solidarity, maintaining village ties and reciprocity as reasons for becoming active (Wuthnow 1998). Such social norms are created through various forms of civic engagement that involve personal interaction in a diffuse set of activities (Salamon 2003). Edmondson (2001; p. 66) refers to this as 'grounded participation', which to some members of a village community is 'well known, simply obvious, what has to be done; local common sense prescribes appropriate behaviour, and these prescriptions are followed without exception'. Volunteering is therefore considered both a mechanism for building trust and reciprocity and an outcome of strong inwardly orientated social networks.

But do selective forms of attachment also result in volunteering? On the one hand, residents with selective forms of village attachment may still like to practise hobbies close to home, pursue societal ideals or, if they have children, engage in child-related activities (cf. Haartsen & Stockdale 2017; Sardinha 2014). Also, Benson & Jackson (2012) emphasise the performative dimension of selective belonging as a way in which middle-class residents become involved in processes of place-making. Seeking to uphold their representations of the rural idyll, 'selective belongers' are often well aware of the need to improve local deficiencies in order to adapt their living environment to their idealised standards. Voluntary work therefore allows residents to shape and transform local society in accordance with personal beliefs and requirements (Hanlon et al. 2014). There is likely to be a correlation between the related form of selective attachment and activity type. For example, the number of formal local contacts is found to predict residents' participation in social organisations and community improvement activities (Liu & Besser 2003) whereas environmental attachment is associated with pro-environmental behaviour (Scannell & Gifford 2010). Furthermore, cultural attachment can be manifested in an active engagement with local cultural practices, festivities and customs (Panelli et al. 2008).

On the other hand, some residents may be increasingly selective in not finding every aspect of rural living equally desirable and may choose non-identification and non-participation with specific parts of the village (Skerrat & Steiner 2013; Hafer & Ran 2016). Residents without a general attachment may perceive volunteering as optional and instrumental, which suggest that volunteering may depend exclusively on personal interests and lifestyle preferences (Holmes 2014). Selective forms of attachment may therefore only result in noncommittal and volatile motivations for volunteering, whereby volunteers can always decide to quit prematurely. In other words, not all residents perceive volunteering in village life as a matter of course or may wish to volunteer out of a profound love for the village.

The way rural residents are attached to their living environment is believed to be an important predictor of the willingness to volunteer in various types of village clubs and organisations (Benson & Jackson 2012; Zwiers et al. 2016). Whereas some elect to belong to specific sub-sections of the village, others may have developed long-lasting historical bonds with the village, resulting in a strong general attachment. In line with the above-mentioned theoretical expectations, we posit that general attachment to the village predicts volunteering in village life, but that selective forms of attachment to the village may also do so. Specifically, we hypothesise a correlation between general attachment and volunteering in a wide range of village organisations, whereas selective forms of attachment only contribute to volunteering in activities related to the specific form of attachment.

### **3. Methods**

#### *Sample*

The data we present in this paper were collected in autumn 2014 by means of a paper and online questionnaire as part of the Socially Vital Countryside database '14 survey (SVP'14), carried out by the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP). The survey was conducted among a sample of the rural population of the Netherlands, defined as the inhabitants of Dutch villages (< 3,000 inhabitants) and outlying areas, with a minimum age of 15 years. For reasons beyond the scope of the present study, elderly residents were overrepresented. Statistics Netherlands (CBS) drew a random sample from the Municipal Administration (GBA), and developed a weighting factor correcting for selective representation on the basis of age, gender, ethnicity, household income, source of income, village size, proximity to the city and part of the country. Consequently, valid and reliable statements can be made that apply to the wider rural population. The cross-sectional data does, however, not show how residents' attachment may have changed over time, nor allow for empirical conclusions regarding the causal direction of statistical relations.

The survey addresses a range of topics with regard to the participation, self-reliance and quality of life of village residents. In total, 7840 rural residents completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 48 percent. To ensure that respondents were oriented to a particular village, residents living more than 500 metres outside the village (self-reported) were excluded from the analyses, leaving 5509 respondents. Because responses for some questions were missing, 4757 cases were used in the actual analyses.

#### *Variables*

This study distinguishes three types of variables:

*Volunteering in village life* - we asked whether respondents were voluntarily active in six forms of community life: (1) sports clubs, (2) hobby clubs (e.g. drama or music), (3) primary school-related activities, (4) neighbourhood or village councils, (5) local historical associations and (6) nature or environment-related organisations. Active involvement in one of these local organisations may include, for example, organisational work, coaching a youth team, maintaining a website, collecting money for charity, attending meetings or organizing events. For each type of organisation, we classified respondents as either a non-volunteer (no volunteering or less than one hour a month) or a volunteer (volunteering one hour or more per month). Thus, our focus was on volunteering in formal village

organisations only and ‘non-volunteers’ may be involved in community life in other ways than those captured by this research such as informal volunteering in any less formalised activities.

*Attachment to the village* – this study distinguishes one general form and three selective forms of place attachment (social, cultural, and environmental), which were measured using 14 closed items (Table 1). The scales used to operationalise different dimensions of place attachment were slightly different compared with those commonly used in the environmental psychology literature. In the latter field of study, measurement scales usually reflect the perceived importance of specific aspects of place for respondents (cf. Scannell & Gifford 2010). The dimensions of general and environmental attachment were calculated in a similar manner, whereas respondents in this study were asked to indicate the extent of their local social ties and involvement in village culture in order to calculate the strength of their social and cultural attachments, respectively.

The four forms of place attachment each consist of several items with a high Cronbach’s alpha. For each variable, the items were averaged and subsequently standardised to correct for different scales of measurement.

*Socio-demographic variables* – a number of socio-demographic factors have been added to the analysis as control variables that previous research has shown to be important to volunteering: gender, age, educational level, length of residency, living in a household with or without children, physical disability, church attendance, village size and distance to a city. By including these control variables, the research aims to take account of contrasting histories and regional differences which can be found across rural settlements.

#### *Logistic regression analysis*

We used logistic regression analysis to assess which forms of place attachment are correlated with volunteering in various types of village organisations for different groups of residents while controlling for a number of sociodemographic variables. The regression model estimates how different forms of place attachment and various personal and village characteristics increase or reduce the chances of being a volunteer in various types of village organisations. A positive  $\beta$ -coefficient means that an increased value on the independent variable increases the probability of being a volunteer. If the sign of the  $\beta$ -coefficient is negative, an increase in the value of the independent variable leads to a lower probability of being a volunteer.

## **4. Results**

### *Descriptive results*

On average, respondents volunteered most actively in sports and hobby clubs (table 2). Almost one in five residents volunteered at least one hour a month at a local sports club. Respondents were least active in local historical associations: around eight percent of the sample actively volunteered for this village association. General attachment to the village was found to have remained a relevant form of place attachment within this study’s sample. Furthermore, it is hard to directly compare the three forms of selective attachment due to the disparate ways of phrasing and scaling the individual items. The high average score for environmental attachment may indicate that a village’s environmental qualities such as space, quietness and greenery resonate well with romanticised ideas about living in an ‘enchanted landscape’ (Savage 2010). Also, the low score for cultural forms of attachment may fit



in a larger context in which local cultural expressions and practices are becoming less common (Milbourne & Kitchen 2014; Driessen 2005).

#### *Village attachment and volunteering*

As argued, we expected to find a relationship between general attachment and volunteering in various village organisations. We also expected selective forms of attachment to result in volunteering in associated village organisations. The results only partially meet the first expectation (table 3). A general attachment to the village led to volunteering in sports, hobby, primary school-related activities and village councils, but not to volunteering in local historical and nature or landscape associations. These latter two associations normally organise activities where older and like-minded residents meet and interact. However, the strength of the significant relationships is considered moderate at best, indicating that the impact of general attachment on volunteering is not very strong.

In contrast, relationships between selective forms of attachment and volunteering are found to be substantial. Judging by the  $\beta$ -coefficients, social attachment is the best predictor of volunteering and is found to affect volunteering in all types of village clubs and associations, with the exception of nature and landscape associations. Lewicka (2005) reports a similar relationship between the number neighbourhood ties and civic activity. This means that rural residents with a social attachment to the village are most likely to volunteer. It is plausible that social attachment contributes to volunteering because social ties will encourage motivation, information about other local organisations as well as social pressure. It is important, however, to bear in mind that active involvement in village organisations can also lead to an increased number of local contacts. A reverse causation between social attachment and volunteering is therefore likely to occur.

The expectation that cultural attachment would enhance volunteering in cultural activities such as hobby clubs and local historical associations was supported by the findings. Moreover, village residents with a cultural attachment were also relatively likely to volunteer in local councils and nature and landscape organisations. This latter finding is noteworthy because some residents seem to engage in these latter kinds of organisation as part of their cultural attachment.

As expected, attachment to the village's environmental qualities only contributed to volunteering in nature and environmental organisations and not any other type of village activity. This was expected as selective attachment confined to the village's environmental qualities bears little relationship to socially orientated village organisations. In fact, a negative relationship was found between environmental attachment and volunteering in sports clubs. This finding suggests that residents with a strong attachment to nature, quietness and spaciousness were somewhat less likely to be closely engaged with local community life than similar residents with a weaker environmental attachment. This seems to confirm popular notions that residents who have moved to live a quiet life in the countryside remain aloof from village life.

#### *In-migrants and volunteering*

Interestingly, the correlations between residential history and volunteering in various village clubs and associations are mostly insignificant. Further analyses have explored the role of residential history in relation to village attachment and volunteering. First, dividing the descriptive results into four groups of residents based on their length of residency shows that long-term residents volunteered more

frequently in village life than recent in-migrants and that long-term in-migrants eventually become as active in village life as village-born residents (table 4). The results indicate that in-migrants start off with strong feelings of attachment to the natural living environment. This is consistent with the findings from other studies that rural in-migrants explore their new residential area before moving there. The preconceptions of the physical environment are usually met because it is relatively easy when looking for a house to obtain a good impression of a village's environmental qualities compared to its social qualities (Bijker et al. 2015; Zwiers et al. 2016). Social and cultural attachment require a longer residency in order to develop. Second, if we only include sociodemographic variables in the logistic regression, we find that long-term and village-born residents volunteered significantly more often than recent in-migrants (table 5). This effect disappears when the four attachment variables are introduced. Length of residency and the attachment variables share a considerable degree of variation, and the effect of length of residency is partially explained away by the attachment variables. In other words, in-migrants volunteer less than village-born residents because they have less social or other attachment. When in-migrants remain in the village for decades and their village attachment increases, their volunteering increases as well.

Another sociodemographic variable that encourages volunteering is gender, with men being more likely to participate in sports clubs and village councils and women volunteering more often in schools. Older generations are more active volunteers in most village organisations, but there is one noteworthy exception: volunteering in school-related activities seems to be a life-course affair (Haartsen & Stockdale 2017). Judging by their age, respondents with school-aged children and grandparents are most likely to volunteer in primary school-related activities. Furthermore, more highly educated residents volunteer more actively in village life, particularly in village councils and historical associations (cf. Musick & Wilson 2008). Perhaps lower educated residents may indeed feel that village organisations are 'for other people than them' (Williams 2002; p. 144). A reason for concern might be that residents with a disability do significantly less voluntary work in sports clubs (see Tonts 2005 for a discussion on sports clubs as potentially exclusive to outsiders).

## **5. Conclusion**

This paper has contributed to the international rural literature by providing an empirical assessment of contemporary patterns of village attachment. Building on the insightful work of Savage (2005; 2010) and Gustafson (2001; 2014), we used a quantitative method to show that. Besides a general and all-encompassing attachment to the village, villagers attach to their village by a number of selective forms of attachment. Of the distinguished dimensions of village attachment, in particular social attachment proved highly predictive of volunteering in local clubs and associations.

Specifically, we explored whether general and selective forms of attachment to the village have a different impact on voluntary citizen activity in various local clubs and organisations. Based on data collected in rural areas of the Netherlands, two findings emerge. First, the correlation between general attachment and volunteering is weaker than expected. This contradicts our hypothesis that rural residents would actively volunteer in village life because of their strong general and historical attachments to the village. Although a general attachment to the village is still found to be relevant in present-day Dutch rural societies, its unique contribution to explaining volunteering is low. We therefore contend that a strong general attachment does not necessarily translate into active volunteering. This shows that the ability to 'elect to belong' is not confined to mobile and new

residents: village-born residents are also selective in their decisions to become active in village life. In that sense, Savage's (2010) distinction between 'elective belonging' and 'dwelling and nostalgia' may not be in strict opposition with each other.

Second, selective forms of attachment are found to be salient predictors of volunteering in village life. This corresponds to Benson & Jackson's (2012) conceptualisation of the 'performative dimension of elective belonging', which stresses the importance of 'practice' in the process of becoming attached to a place. Following Savage's (2005; 2010) and Watt's (2009) notions of elective and selective belonging, we argued that rural residents have options about how they shape their local attachment and involvement. In this process we expected that a general and all-encompassing form of attachment to the village is being replaced by more selective forms of attachment in which rural residents have and make individual choices. This study therefore presents the comforting thought that selective forms of attachment also encourage people to volunteer. Specifically, a village where residents have access to a large local social network could guarantee that volunteering rates remain high. At the same time, the strengthening of village identity is not expected to create more motivation to volunteer.

The finding that social attachment is the strongest predictor of volunteering raises questions about how selective forms of attachment relate to current rural policy developments, such as a greater emphasis on citizen activity and co-creation (Farmer et al. 2012; Woolvin & Hardill 2013). A reticent government encourages residents to become increasingly responsible for the quality and development of their residential area. Rural communities with strong village-based bonds are seen as attractive sites for voluntary initiatives and service provision. It is expected that especially villages with a socially engaged village community are able to proactively safeguard village liveability in the era of governmental withdrawal. In such communities, it is likely that high levels of trust and solidarity occur, two conditions why rural dwellers are found to do more voluntary work compared to their urban counterparts (Svendsen & Svendsen 2016). Thus, a social component is important in present-day voluntarism, which makes it likely that many individuals are seeking ways to meet and interact with fellow residents through volunteering. This concurs with Neal and Walters' (2008) argument that semi-formal village organisations are pivotal in the creation of social spaces and an inclusive rural community. Conversely, residents' volunteering to establish collective facilities, such as energy or healthcare cooperatives, in villages that do not have socially engaged communities may prove difficult.

The finding that each form of selective attachment results in citizen activity suggests that a gradual transition from general to selective forms of attachment will not necessarily jeopardise the existence of active village communities. Residents, including in-migrants, are expected to remain motivated to engage in voluntary work related to their specific form of attachment. And yet our study also raises a number of concerns. First, volunteering based on selective attachments could create conflict and tension within village communities (Smith & Krannich 2000; Woods 2011). In some cases, different forms of attachment are associated with different ideas and desires regarding the living environment. In-migrants with a strong environmental attachment may have a stability-orientated perception of the village surroundings, which may differ significantly from the perceptions of longer-term residents with a cultural attachment who might be more change-orientated (Zwiers et al. 2016). Second, many village residents do not unquestioningly perceive volunteering as a part of village life which may increase the risk of sudden withdrawal or loss of interest, potentially frustrating residents who actively volunteer. The rise of 'elective belonging' may therefore lead to divisions between active and non-active residents both between and within villages. Third, it is questionable whether residents without a sufficiently

large local social network can expect to receive reciprocal solidarity from fellow residents. This may particularly be detrimental to more isolated elderly residents who increasingly have to rely on informal mechanisms of neighbourhood support.

All in all, we argue that reasons for volunteering in village life are becoming more diverse. Present-day rural residents may not volunteer out of love for the village as a whole, but instead do so because of a selective attachment to specific sub-sections of the village. Future efforts to strengthen local communities should take into account the heterogeneous ways that residents are attached to their villages in order to encourage voluntarism (Gielsing et al. 2017). Whether an increased policy emphasis on volunteering in rural areas is desirable is discussed elsewhere (cf. Mohan 2012; Jones & Heley 2016), but the fact remains that rural communities are likely to be allocated more responsibilities in the near future. In any case, it is not correct to assume that residents with a general and all-encompassing attachment to the village perceive volunteering as a matter of course. Residents are not expected to volunteer for better or for worse but rather they do so out of a selective love for the village.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editor for their valuable feedback on earlier drafts of this paper.

### **6. References**

- Agnitsch, K., Flora, J. & Ryan, V. (2006). Bonding and bridging social capital: The interactive effects on community action. *Community Development*, 37(1), 36–51.
- Allen, J. & Mueller, S. (2013). The revolving door: A closer look at major factors in 589 volunteers' intention to quit. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(2), 139-155.
- Andrews, C.J. (2001). Analyzing quality-of-place. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*. 28, 201-207.
- Anton, C.A. & Lawrence, C. (2014). Home is where the heart is: The effect of place of residence on place attachment and community participation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 40, 451-461.
- Bagley, C.A. & Hillyard, S. (2014). Rural schools, social capital and the Big Society: A theoretical and empirical exposition'. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 63-67.
- Barcus, H.R. & Brunn, S.D. (2010). Place elasticity: Exploring a new conceptualization of mobility and place attachment in rural America. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 92(4), 281–295.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Benson, M. & Jackson, E. (2012). Place-making and place maintenance: Performativity, place and belonging among the middle classes. *Sociology*, 47(4), 793-809.
- Bijker, R., Haartsen, T. & Strijker, D. (2015). How people move to rural areas: Insights in the residential search process from a diary approach. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 38, 77–88.
- Brodie, E., Cowling, E. & Nissen, N. (2009) *Understanding participation: A literature review*. London: Involve.

- Brown, B. & Perkins, D. (1992). Disruptions in place attachment (pp. 279–304). In: Altman, I. & Low, S. (Eds.). *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum.
- Brown, D. & Schafft, K. (2011). *Rural people & communities in the 21th century. Resilience & transformation*. Cambridge & Malden: Polity Press.
- Driessen, G. (2005). In Dutch? Usage of Dutch regional languages and dialects. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 18(3), 271-285.
- Edmondson, R. (2001). Studying civic culture ethnographically and what it tells us about social capital: Communities in the west of Ireland (pp. 59-72). In: Dekker, P. & Uslaner, E.M. (eds.). *Social Capital and Participation in Every Day Life*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Farmer, J., Hill, C. & Munoz, S. eds (2012). *Community co-production: social enterprise in remote and rural area*. Boston, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Gieling, J. & Haartsen, T. (2017). Liveable villages: the relationship between volunteering and liveability in the perceptions of rural residents. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 57(S1), 576-597.
- Gieling, J., Vermeij, L. & Haartsen, T. (2017). Beyond the local-newcomer divide: Rural place attachment in the era of mobilities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 55, 237-247.
- Goodwin-Hawkins, B. (2015). Mobilities and the English village: Moving beyond fixity in rural West Yorkshire. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 55(2), 167–181.
- Groot, J.P. (1989). Dorpsbinding en lokaal bewustzijn. In: Huigen, P. & Van der Velde, M. (eds.) *De achterkant van verstedelijkt Nederland. De positie en functie van landelijke gebieden in de Nederlandse samenleving*. Amsterdam & Utrecht: KNAG/GIRU.
- Gustafson, P. (2001). Meanings of place: Everyday experience and theoretical conceptualizations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(1), 5–16.
- Gustafson, P. (2009). More cosmopolitan, no less local. *European Societies*, 11(1), 25-47.
- Gustafson, P. (2014). Place attachment in an age of mobility. In: L. C. Manzo & P. Devine-Wright (eds.) *Place attachment: Advances in theory, methods and applications*. Abingdon; Routledge. Pp. 37-48.
- Haartsen, T. & Stockdale, A. (2017). S/elective belonging and the perceived freedom to move: how rural newcomers families with children become stayers. *People, Place & Space*. 'Online version'.
- Haartsen, T. & Venhorst, V. (2010). Planning for decline: Anticipating on population decline in the Netherlands. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 101(2), 218-227.
- Hafer, J.A. & Ran, B. (2016). Developing a citizen perspective of public participation: Identity construction as citizen motivation to participate. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 38, 206–222.
- Hanlon, N. et al. (2014). Place integration through efforts to support healthy aging in resource frontier communities: The role of voluntary sector leadership. *Health & Place*, 29, 132-139.
- Holmes, K. (2014). 'It fitted in with our lifestyle': An investigation into episodic volunteering in the tourism sector. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 17(4), 443-459.

- Hunter, A.J. & Suttles, G.D. (1972). The expanding community of limited liability (pp. 44–80). In: Suttles, G.D. (ed.) *The social construction of communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hustinx, L. & Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological modernization perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Volunteering and Nonprofit Organizations*, 14, 167–187.
- Jones, L. & Heley, J. (2016). Practices of participation and voluntarism among older people in rural Wales: Choice, obligation and constraints to active ageing. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(2), 176–196.
- Keur, J.Y. & Keur, D.L. (1955) *The deeply rooted; A study of a Drents community in the Netherlands*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Lewicka, M. (2005). Ways to make people active: The role of place attachment, cultural capital, and neighborhood ties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25, 381–395.
- Lewicka, M. (2013). Place inherited or place discovered? Agency and communion in people-place bonding. *Estudios de Psicología*, 34(23), 261–274.
- Liu, Q.L. & Besser, T. (2003). Social capital and participation in community improvement activities by elderly residents in small towns and rural communities. *Rural Sociology*, 68(3), 343–365.
- Low, S. & Altman, I. (1992). Place attachment: A conceptual inquiry. In: Altman, I. & Low, S. (Eds) *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum.
- Manzo, L.C. & Perkins, D.D. (2006). Finding common ground: The importance of place attachment to community participation and planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20(4), 335–350.
- McHugh, K. & Mings, R. (1996). The circle of migration: Attachment to place in aging. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 86(3), 530–550.
- Milbourne, P. & Kitchen, L. (2014). Rural mobilities: Connecting movement and fixity in rural places. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34(2), 326–336.
- Mohan, J. (2012). Geographical foundations of the Big Society. *Environment and Planning A*, 44, 1121–1129.
- Mohnen, S., Volker, B., Flap, H. & Groenewegen, P. (2012). Health-related behavior as a mechanism behind the relationship between neighborhood social capital and individual health – a multilevel analysis. *BMS Public Health*, 12, 116–124.
- Musick, M. & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Neal, S. & Walters, S. (2008). Rural be/longing and rural social organisations: Conviviality and community-making in the English countryside. *Sociology*, 42(2): 279–297.
- Panelli, R., Allen, D., Ellison, B., Kelly, A., John, A., et al. (2008) Beyond Bluff oysters? Place identity and ethnicity in a peripheral coastal setting. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, 41–55.

- Posthumus, H., Van Houwelingen P. & Dekker, P. (2011). Maatschappelijke en politieke participatie en betrokkenheid (pp. 181-200). In: Bijl, R., Boelhouwer, J., Pommer, E. & Sonck N. (eds.). *De Sociale Staat van Nederland 2013*. The Hague; The Netherlands Institute for Social Research.
- Ralph, D. & Staeheli, L.A. (2011). Home and migration: mobilities, belongings and identities. *Geography Compass*, 5(7), 517-530.
- Salamon, S. (2003). From hometown to nontown: Rural community effect of suburbanization. *Rural Sociology*, 68(1), 1-24.
- Salemink, K., Strijker, D. & Bosworth, G. (2017). The community reclaims control? Learning experiences from rural broadband initiatives in the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 57(S1), 555-575.
- Sampson, R., Raudenbush, S., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.
- Sardinha, J. (2014). Lifestyle migrants in Central Portugal. Strategies of settlement and socialisation (pp. 174-189). In: Janoschka, M. & Haas, H. (eds). *Contested Spatialities, Lifestyle Migration and Residential Tourism*. New York: Routledge.
- Savage, M., Bagnall, G. & Longhursts, B. (2005). *Globalization & Belonging*. London: Sage Publications.
- Savage, M. (2010). The politics of elective belonging. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 27(2), 115–161.
- Savage, M. (2014). Cultural capital and elective belonging: A British case study (pp. 29–54). In: Thomä, D. Henning, C. & Schmid, H. (Eds.). *Social capital, social identities: From ownership to belonging*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Scannell, L. & Gifford, R. (2010). The relations between natural and civic place attachment and pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(3), 289–297.
- Simmel, G. (1971). *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Skerratt, S. & Steiner, A. (2013). Working with communities-of-place: complexities of empowerment. *Local Economy*, 28(3) 320–338.
- Smith, M. & Krannich, R. (2000). Culture clash revisited: Newcomer and long-term residents' attitudes toward land use, development, and environmental issues in rural communities in the Rocky Mountains West. *Rural Sociology*, 63(3), 396-421.
- Steenbekkers, A. & Vermeij, L. (2013). *De dorpenmonitor. Ontwikkelingen in de leefsituatie van dorpen*. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research.
- Stockdale, A. (2015). Contemporary and “messy” rural in-migration processes: Comparing counterurban and lateral rural migration. *Population, Space and Place*, 22, 599-616.
- Svendsen, G.L. & Svendsen, G.T. (2016). Homo voluntarius and the rural idyll: Voluntary work, trust and solidarity in rural and urban areas. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 11(1), 55-72.

Thissen, F. & Droogleever Fortuijn, J. (1998). *Sociale cohesie en dorpsverenigingen op het Drentse platteland*. Amsterdam: AME Amsterdam Study Centre for the Metropolitan Environment University of Amsterdam.

Tönnies, F. ([1887] 1957). *Community and Society (Gemeinschaft Und Gesellschaft)*. Translated by C. Loomis. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Tonts, M. (2005). Competitive sport and social capital in rural Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21, 137-149.

Verhoeven, I. & Tonkens, E. (2013). Talking active citizenship: Framing welfare state reform in England and the Netherlands. *Social Policy and Society*, 12(3), 415-426.

Vermeij, L. (2015). *Dichtbij huis. Lokale binding en inzet van dorpsbewoners*. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research.

Walker, J. & Li, J. (2007). Latent lifestyle preferences and household location decisions. *Journal of Geographical Systems*, 9(1), 77-101.

Watt, P. (2009). Living in an oasis: middle-class disaffiliation and selective belonging in an English suburb. *Environment and Planning A*, 41, 2874-2892.

Wellman, B. (1979). The community question: The intimate networks of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(5), 1201-1231.

Williams, C. (2002). Harnessing community self-help: Some lessons from rural England. *Local Economy*, 17(2), 136-146.

Woods, M. (2011). *Rural*. London & New York: Routledge.

Woolvin, M. & Hardill, I. (2013). Localism, voluntarism and devolution: Experiences, opportunities and challenges in a changing policy context. *Local Economy*, 28(3), 275-290.

Wuthnow, R. (1998). *Loose connections. Joining together in America's fragmented communities*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.

Zwiers, S., Markantoni, M. & Strijker, D., (2016). The role of change- and stability-oriented place attachment in rural community resilience. *Community Development*. 0(0), 1-20.



**Table 1: Forms of place attachment used as variables in logistic regression analyses**

Dimension	Item	Scale	Mean	Cronbach's Alpha
General attachment	1. 'I care a lot about this village'	Varies from 'totally disagree' (1) to 'totally agree' (5)	3.76	.86
	2. 'I feel connected with this village'		3.82	
	3. 'it is a village close to my heart'		3.62	
Social Attachment	1. 'Approximately how many village inhabitants do you know by their first name?'	Varies from 'none' (1) to 'more than 50' (5)	4.26	.81
	2. 'Approximately how many village inhabitants visit your home from time to time?'		3.00	
	3. 'With approximately how many village inhabitants do you discuss personal matters?'		2.31	
	4. 'Approximately how many village inhabitants could you ask for help? (e.g., with a small job around the house)?'		2.51	
Cultural attachment	In your spare time, how often do you:			.77
	1. ...watch a local or regional television channel?	Item 1 and 2: Varying from 'never' (1) to 'more than two hours daily' (5)	2.42	
	2. ... listen to a local radio station?		2.26	
	3. ... speak a local dialect or language?	Item 3, 4 and 5: Varying from 'never' (1) to 'often'(4)	2.77	
	4. ... eat local dishes or ingredients typical of the region?		2.52	
	5. ... listen to local music?		1.90	
Environmental attachment	How important are the following things for living pleasantly?	Varying from 'Not at all important' (1) to 'Very important' (4).		.71
	1. 'Quietness and space'		3.46	
	2. 'The landscape surrounding me'		3.42	

**Table 2: Summary statistics of variables used in logistic regression models (N=4757)**

	Mean	SD
Sports clubs (0=not active, 1=active)	.20	.40
Hobby clubs (0=not active, 1=active)	.13	.34
School-related activities (0=not active, 1=active)	.13	.34
Village councils (0=not active, 1=active)	.10	.30
Local historical associations (0=not active, 1=active)	.08	.28
Nature & landscape (0=not active, 1=active)	.09	.29
General attachment (1=lowest, 5=highest)	3.76	1.23
Social attachment (1=lowest, 5=highest)	3.02	.72
Cultural attachment (1=lowest, 5=highest)	2.38	.90
Environmental attachment (1=lowest, 4=highest)	3.44	.55
Gender (0=male, 1=female)	.50	.50
Age category (in years of age)		
15-29	13.85	
30-45	16.75	
46-60	28.34	
61-75	25.05	
75+	16.01	
Length of residency		
Less than 10 years	17.44	
Between 10 and 30 years	30.64	
Longer than 30 years	24.69	
Village-born residents	27.23	
Educational level		
Low	37.74	
Medium	34.06	
High	28.20	
Household with children (0=without children, 1=with children)	.44	.50
Physical disability <sup>1</sup> (0=no disability, 1=disability)	.21	.41
Church attendance <sup>2</sup> (0=not church going, 1=church going)	.22	.42
Village size		
1-500 residents	18.03	
500-1500 residents	41.26	
1500-3000 residents	40.72	
Distance to city <sup>3</sup> (0=near city, 1=away from city)	.73	.45

1=this variable is composed of questions related to one's physical condition. We asked if a respondent has difficulties with a number of daily activities in and around the house. If the respondent answered at least one question with 'yes' then that person was classified as being disabled

2=a respondent is considered 'church going' as they indicated to go to church at least once a month

3=we measured proximity to a city by calculating if a respondent is able to reach 150000 people within 15 minutes travel distance by road. If yes, then the respondent is considered to be living in a village near a city, as opposed to living away from a city

**Table 3: Results logistic regression analyses**

	Sports clubs	Hobby clubs	School-related activities	Village councils	Historical associations	Nature & landscape
General attachment	<b>.24*</b>	<b>.19*</b>	<b>.17*</b>	<b>.27*</b>	.04	-.04
Social attachment	<b>.73*</b>	<b>.47*</b>	<b>.25*</b>	<b>.54*</b>	<b>.38*</b>	.16
Cultural attachment	.05	<b>.23*</b>	.07	<b>.25*</b>	<b>.23*</b>	<b>.32*</b>
Environmental attachment	<b>-.23*</b>	.01	-.03	-.06	.22	<b>.53*</b>
Female	<b>-.53*</b>	-.02	<b>.67*</b>	<b>-.34*</b>	-.11	<b>-.37*</b>
Age category						
15-29	-.21	.04	<b>-.41*</b>	-.25	<b>-1.18*</b>	-.37
30-45	-.01	-.35	<b>1.00*</b>	-.15	-.15	-.38
46-60 (ref)						
61-75	-.13	<b>.42*</b>	<b>.64*</b>	.35	<b>.89*</b>	<b>.61*</b>
75+	-.05	<b>.60*</b>	<b>1.15*</b>	<b>.93*</b>	<b>1.11*</b>	<b>.77*</b>
Length of residency						
Less than 10 years	-.24	.11	-.02	.18	-.35	.13
Between 11 and 30 years	-.01	.05	.15	.09	<b>-.41*</b>	<b>.37*</b>
Longer than 30 years	.07	.09	.00	.12	-.03	.20
Village-born residents (ref)						
Educational level						
Low	.01	-.33	-.21	.15	-.06	-.26
Medium (ref)						
High	.17	.09	-.00	<b>.37*</b>	<b>.36*</b>	.03
Household with children	<b>.33*</b>	<b>-.31*</b>	<b>1.22*</b>	-.22	-.31	-.28
Physical disability	<b>-.42*</b>	.08	-.04	-.05	-.15	.27
Church attendance	<b>-.33*</b>	<b>.41*</b>	<b>.32*</b>	-.23	.26	.18
Village size						
1-500 residents	<b>-.38*</b>	.21	.20	<b>.54*</b>	.27	<b>.39*</b>
500-1500 residents (ref)						
1500-3000 residents	-.03	.09	.07	-.09	-.09	-.16
Distance to city	-.00	.16	.09	<b>.31*</b>	.15	.03
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	<i>.10</i>	<i>.07</i>	<i>.12</i>	<i>.08</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>.08</i>

\*= $p < .05$

**Table 4: Detailed descriptive results showing the distribution between resident's length of residency, forms of attachment and volunteering<sup>1</sup>**

	0 to 10 years	11 to 30 years	30 years or longer	Village-born residents
General attachment	3.25 (1.25)	3.51 (1.22)	3.77 (1.19)	3.95 (1.16)
Social attachment	2.62 (.71)	2.90 (.71)	3.03 (.67)	3.26 (.67)
Cultural attachment	1.95 (.77)	2.17 (.84)	2.61 (.92)	2.62 (.87)
Environmental attachment	3.51 (.54)	3.49 (.54)	3.51 (.51)	3.37 (.58)
Sports clubs	.13 (.33)	.17 (.38)	.21 (.41)	.24 (.43)
Hobby clubs	.07 (.25)	.11 (.31)	.18 (.38)	.15 (.36)
Primary school	.11 (.31)	.13 (.34)	.14 (.35)	.14 (.35)
Neighbourhood & village council	.05 (.22)	.08 (.27)	.13 (.34)	.11 (.31)
Local historical association	.03 (.18)	.06 (.23)	.14 (.34)	.10 (.30)
Nature & landscape association	.06 (.24)	.09 (.29)	.15 (.35)	.12 (.32)

1= General, social and cultural attachment are measured on a scale from 1 to 5, environmental attachment on a scale from 1 to 4. Volunteering measured by 0=no, 1=yes. Standard deviations between parentheses

**Table 5: Hierarchical logistic regression analyses with blocks of sociodemographic variables and attachment variables<sup>1</sup>**

	Sports clubs		Hobby clubs		School-related activities		Village councils		Historical associations		Nature & landscape	
Length of residency												
Less than 10 years	<b>-.86*</b>	-.24	<b>-.43*</b>	.11	<b>-.32*</b>	-.02	<b>-.48*</b>	.18	<b>-.76*</b>	-.35	-.09	.13
Between 11 and 30 years	<b>-.34*</b>	-.01	-.28	.05	-.03	.15	-.31	.09	<b>-.67*</b>	<b>-.41*</b>	.21	<b>.37*</b>
Longer than 30 years	-.03	.07	-.03	.09	-.05	.00	-.04	.12	-.14	-.03	.15	.20
Village-born residents (ref)												
General attachment		<b>.24*</b>		<b>.19*</b>		<b>.17*</b>		<b>.27*</b>		.04		-.04
Social attachment		<b>.73*</b>		<b>.47*</b>		<b>.25*</b>		<b>.54*</b>		<b>.38*</b>		.16
Cultural attachment		.05		<b>.23*</b>		.07		<b>.25*</b>		<b>.23*</b>		<b>.32*</b>
Environmental attachment		<b>-.23*</b>		.01		-.03		-.06		.22		<b>.53*</b>
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.05	.10	.03	.07	.10	.12	.04	.08	.09	.11	.06	.08

1= For purposes of clarity only length of residency (first block) and attachment variables (second block) are reported. The logistic regressions control for gender, age, education, type of household, physical disability, church attendance, village size and distance to city

\*= $p < .05$